

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on January 9 2007, and the references cited therewith. In the accompanying amendment claims 1-14 have been amended. Additionally, claim 2 has been canceled, and new claims 15-17 have been added. The amendments to the claims are fully supported by the originally filed written description, claims, and drawings. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the amendment to the claims does not add new matter.

Specification

The examiner objected to the abstract of the disclosure because it contained two paragraphs. In response, applicants have amended the abstract of the disclosure so that it now only contains a single paragraph. Accordingly, the examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the objection to the abstract of the disclosure.

Claim objections

The examiner objected to claims 1-2 because of minor informalities contained in those claims. The informalities in so far as claim 1 is concerned have been addressed in the accompanying amendment. Moreover, claim 2 has been canceled. Thus, it is a suspect who submitted that all informalities mentioned by the examiner have been addressed. Accordingly, the examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the objections to claims 1-2.

Duplicate claims

The examiner has objected to claim 2 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 1 under 37 CFR 1.75. Given that claim 2 has now been deleted, the examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the objection to claim 2 under 37 CFR 1.75.

§112 Rejection of the Claims

The examiner objected to claims 1-14 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In particular, with respect to claim 1 the examiner sought clarity on what is meant by “recognition of objects” in line 5 of the claim and how the further steps in the claim related to the step of recognizing objects. In response, claim 1 has been amended to make clear that an object, for example, a text object, or a graphics object, is first identified and then recognized. In view of this amendment, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner’s request for clarification of claim 1, is addressed. Accordingly, the examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the objection to claim 35 USC §112, second paragraph.

It is respectfully submitted that the 35 USC §112, second paragraph issue with regard to claim 2 is now moot, given that this claim has not been canceled. Accordingly the examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 USC §112, second paragraph rejection of claim 2.

Regarding claims 3–4, the examiner sought clarification on the meaning of the term “alternative” in those claims. In the accompanying amendment the term “alternative” has been replaced with the term “alternative variants”, which it is respectfully submitted, complies with the provisions of 35 USC §112, second paragraph. Accordingly the examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the objection under 35 USC §112, second paragraph vis-à-vis claims 3–4.

With regard to claim 5, the examiner sought clarification of the term “interval”. In response, claim 5 has been amended to make clear that the term “interval” is “for at least one spatially parametrical correlation value”. Accordingly the examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 USC §112, second paragraph rejection of claim 5.

Regarding claims 6–10, and 13–14, these claims were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as being dependent on one of rejected base claims 1 and 2. Given that claim 2 has been canceled, and that claim 1 has been amended to make it compliant with 35 USC §112, second paragraph, it is respectfully submitted that claims 6–10, 13–14 now comply with the provisions of 35 USC §112, second paragraph. Accordingly, the examiner is respectfully

requested to withdraw the rejection of claims 6–10, and that 13–14 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (408) 350 0489 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 503437.

Respectfully submitted,

KONSTANTIN ANISIMOVICH et al.

By their Representatives,
Hahn and Moodley LLP
Customer number 52418
TEL: 408 350 0489

Date 3/1/2011

By /Vani Moodley/
Vani Moodley
Reg. No. 56631